



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,047	07/10/2006	Wilhelmus Josephus Bronnenberg	NLO40009	5252
24737 7590 04/27/2010 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER JOHN, CLARENCE				
ART UNIT 2443		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/27/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/597,047

Applicant(s)

BRONNENBERG ET AL.

Examiner

CLARENCE JOHN

Art Unit

2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

This action is responsive to communication filed on January 21, 2010 where the Applicant amended Claims 13 and 25. Claims 13-27 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/15/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and do not place the Application in condition for allowance.
2. With respect to Claim 13, the Applicant argues that Theriault's filtering and querying steps are not independent from one another
3. **In reply**, the Examiner states that Theriault's filtering and querying are independent from one another. (Column 3, lines 35-42; Column 4, lines 50-55. Here the information exchanged does not pass through the proxy which is independent. Per Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device- Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services which is also independent from each other). Also, Theriault teaches filtering and storing of filtered response including all or parts of the modified response in the storage device 330 and sends the modified

response back to the browser. (Column 6, lines 1-7, Column 7, lines 17-22); Theriault further teaches modification (filtered modified response) which is stored in the storage device, which can be used for future reference by the browser i.e. searching or browsing the content directory to browse or review filtered information, Column 8, lines 55-58, further clarifying the review Column 8, lines 59-67).

4. The Applicant also argues that Theriault does not teach searching and browsing of the content directory to review filtered information devoid of the content by network rendering device is performed independently.
5. **In reply**, the Examiner states that Theriault does teach such limitations.

(Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17, . Column 8, lines 55-67. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser., because the user selects the filtering of services which is independent from filtering and querying. Column 6, lines 1-7, Theriault further teaches modification, i.e. filtered modified response stored in the storage device can be used for future reference by the browser, i.e. searching or browsing the content directory to browse or review filtered information, , further clarifying the review); of said filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device. (Column 3, lines 35-42; Column 4, lines 50-55). Here the information exchanged does not

pass through the proxy which is independent. Per Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device-Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services which is also independent from each other).

6. The Applicant also argues that Theriault does not teach that a user has no means of requesting and selecting different services such as filtering from the proxy.
7. **In reply**, the Examiner states that the user selects the desired filtering services by fetching a form and completing and returning it to the proxy information source via the browser. Two classes of filtering services are employed by the proxy, filtering of the query received from the browser prior to forwarding it to the information source and filtering of the response received before forwarding it to the browser. (Column 5, lines 8-17).
8. The Applicant also argues that the references cannot be combined with Theriault as they do not suggest or teach the claimed invention.
9. **In reply**, the Examiner states that Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering. Conversely Hughes teaches such a limitation. Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines

38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

10. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices.

According to the Supreme Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S - 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have been obvious to combine the use of known technique, that is filtering and managing of content information on servers and devices, by combining the teachings of Hughes with Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

11. Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices. Conversely Abdulrahman does in fact teach such a limitation. Abdulrahman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices. Abdulrahman also teaches about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5).

12. Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahman teach about filtering contents among the servers and devices. According to the Supreme Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S - 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have been obvious to combine the use of known technique, that is filtering and

managing of content information on servers and devices, by combining the teachings of Abdulrahiman with Theriault and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

13. Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a method wherein a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices. Conversely Safadi does in fact teach such a limitation. Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital Rights Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2, paragraph [0021, lines 1-2).
14. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. According to the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S - 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have been obvious to combine the use of known technique such as filtering and managing content information by combining the teachings of Safadi with Theriault, and Hughes in order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy protection of content.
15. Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. Conversely Gorman teaches such a limitation. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network.

(Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

16. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. According to the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. - 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have been obvious to combine the use of known technique such as filtering and managing of content information by combining the teachings of Gorman with Theriault and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.
17. Examiner notes that no new matter has been added and that the amended claims are rejected based on the same references as cited by the previous office action.
18. Applicant has failed to clearly point out patentable novelty in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited that would overcome the 103(a) rejections applied against the claims, the rejection is therefore sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 1-12. are Cancelled.

20. Claims 13, 17, 19, and 22 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault et al. (US 6,049,821) in view of Hughes et al. (US 6,065,055).

21. With respect to Claim 13, Theriault teaches a method of filtering and storing information about content stored on at least one network device and accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprising:

22. a) filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17) that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);

23. b) storing in a content directory the filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by said at least one network rendering device; (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

And;

24. c) searching or browsing the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device; (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser., because the user selects the filtering of services which is independent from filtering and querying. Column 6, lines 1-7, Theriault further teaches modification (filtered modified response) can be used for future reference by the browser (i.e. searching or browsing the content directory to browse or review filtered information, Column 8, lines 55-58, further clarifying the review Column 8, lines 59-67); wherein said searching or browsing of the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device is performed independently (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser., because the user selects the filtering of services which is independent from filtering and querying. Column 6, lines 1-7, Theriault further teaches modification, i.e. filtered modified response which can be used for future reference by the browser (i.e. searching or browsing the content directory to browse or review filtered

information, Column 8, lines 55-58, further clarifying the review Column 8, lines 59-67); of said filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device. (Column 3, lines 35-42; Column 4, lines 50-55. Here the information exchanged does not pass through the proxy which is independent. Per Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device- Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services which is also independent from each other).

25. Theriault teaches the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. However, Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

26. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

27. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by

modifying the teachings of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

28. With respect to Claim 17, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitation as described in Claim 13 above.

29. However, Theriault does not explicitly state about said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is repeated over a "predefined time interval".

30. Conversely, Hughes does in fact teach such a limitation. (Hughes's teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval of 5 minutes, Column 5, lines 10-12).

31. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by modifying the teachings of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

32. With respect to Claim 19, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to claim 13 wherein said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is

performed where a new network rendering device is added to the network.

(Therault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17. Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. Here, the user device selecting the filtering services is the new device entering the network).

33. With respect to Claim 22, Therault and Hughes teach a method according to claim 13, further comprising selecting content for transfer via the network to the at least one network rendering device, (Therault's teachings on Column 4, lines 4-9); wherein said selecting is based on the searching or browsing step, (Therault's teachings on Column 8, lines 55-58, i.e. searching or browsing the content directory to browse or review filtered information, further clarifying the review as cited in Column 8, lines 59-67); and wherein said content selected for transfer is renderable by the at least one network rendering device. (Therault's teachings on Figure 1, Browser 100 is the network device).

34. With respect to Claim 23, Therault and Hughes teach a method according to claim 13, further comprising filtering information about the content to yield filtered information including content (Therault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17); that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices, (Therault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services.

i.e. filtering said information); and making available on the network said filtered information including content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device. (Therault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

35. Therault and Hughes teach the limitation of Claim 23 as described above.

However, Therault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

36. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.

(Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

37. Therault and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Therault and Hughes by modifying the teachings of Therault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

38. With respect to Claim 24, Therault and Hughes teach a method according to claim 23, further comprising initiating an action based on said filtered information

including content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device, wherein the action comprises **any** of the following:

- a. upgrading the network; b) downloading and/or installing a codec;
 - 39. c) adapting a security parameter; (Therault's teachings on Column 2, lines 29-36. Here the Proxy server provides security feature to the network);
 - 40. d) recommending the purchase or upgrade of at least one network rendering device; and e) providing a human-perceptible explanation of why content is unusable by the at least one network rendering device.
41. With respect to Claim 25, Therault teaches a device adapted for filtering and storing information about content accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering device adapted for rendering content, the device comprising: a) at least one filtering element adapted to filter information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content (Therault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17) ; that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Therault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information); and
42. b) a storage element containing a content directory including the filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by said at least one

network rendering device; (Therault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system);

43. wherein the content directory is searchable or browseable to enable review of said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device, (Therault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser., because the user selects the filtering of services which is independent from filtering and querying. Column 6, lines 1-7, Therault further teaches modification, i.e. filtered modified response which can be used for future reference by the browser (i.e. searching or browsing the content directory to browse or review filtered information, Column 8, lines 55-58, further clarifying the review as cited in Column 8, lines 59-67); and searching or browsing of the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device is performed independently of said periodic filtering by the at least one filtering element. (Column 3, lines 35-42; Column 4, lines 50-55. Here the information exchanged does not pass through the proxy which is independent. Per Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device- Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services which is also independent from each other) to yield filtered information devoid of content (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17) that cannot be rendered by the at least

one network rendering device. (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17. Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);

44. Theriault teaches the limitations of Claim 25 as described above. However, Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

45. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

46. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by modifying the teaching of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

47. With respect to Claim 26, Theriault and Hughes teach a media server embodying the device of claim 25. (Theriault's teachings on Figure 1, Proxy Server 200).

48. With respect to Claim 27, Theriault and Hughes teach a network comprising the device of claim 25 (Theriault's teachings on Figure 1, Network comprising the Proxy Server 200) and at least one network rendering device (Theriault's teachings on Figure 1, Browser 100).

49. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Abdulrahman et al. (US 2003/0023671)

50. With respect to Claim 14, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 13, wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices comprises content having a format (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17; Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);

51. However Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

52. Conversely Abdulrahman does in fact teach such a limitation. Abdulrahman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices. Abdulrahman also teaches about the content which is not compatible with the

network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5).

53. Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahiman by modifying the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

54. With respect to Claim 15, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 13 wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices comprises content (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17; Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);

55. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content having a transport protocol, which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

56. Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation. Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices
Abdulrahiman also teaches about a content having a transport protocol. (Page 3,

paragraph [0030], lines 6-11, Paragraph [0031], lines 5-8. That is, electronic information transmitted between remote source and proxy via wireless / wire connection must have a transport protocol).

57. Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Abdulrahiman with Theriault and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

58. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

59. With respect to Claim 16, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13.

60. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a method according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.

61. Conversely Safadi does in fact teach such a limitation. Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital Rights Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2, paragraph [0021], lines 1-2).

62. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Safadi with Theriault, and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy protection of content.
63. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Gorman (US 2002/0143780).
64. With respect to Claim 18, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network.
65. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).
66. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Theriault

and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

67. With respect to Claim 20, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. Also, Theriault and Hughes teach a method of filtering (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and storing information about content is performed (Theriault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58); for a predefined time interval (Hughes teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval, Column 5, lines 10-12).
68. However Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about filtering which is performed when a network device has been removed.
69. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).
70. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Theriault and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to

manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

71. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Cheng (US 2002/0078161).

72. With respect to Claim 21, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. Theriault also teaches the information about the content which is stored by content directory service. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

73. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings wherein the network is a UPnP network.

74. Conversely Cheng does in fact teach such a limitation. Cheng teaches about network communication over server and devices in a UPnP network. (Page 2, paragraph [0018], lines 1-5. Figure 1).

75. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices over a network. Cheng teaches about network communication in a UPnP network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Cheng with Theriault, Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by

employing a UPnP network which is self configuring and has the network controller which is capable of discovering and controlling other devices.

Conclusion

The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and /or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification. For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required to cite its corresponding support in the specification.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing

date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2443

Application/Control Number: 10/597,047

Page 25

Art Unit: 2443

4/22/2010

/Tonia LM Dollinger/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443